

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the application and subject to examination.

In the Office Action dated August 9, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nemoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,422,546 B1, hereinafter "Nemoto"). The Applicant hereby traverses the rejections, as follows.

Claim 1 recites, in part:

wherein operation of said active anti-vibration supporting device is prohibited when an abnormality in an operational state of the engine is detected

Claim 11 recites, in part:

wherein the cylinder suspension of the engine is prohibited when an abnormality in an operational state of said active anti-vibration supporting device is detected

The outstanding Office Action asserts that Nemoto discloses all of the limitations of claims 1-10 and 11-20, including the limitations cited above. The Office Action asserts that Nemoto discloses the limitations cited above at Figs. 1-9. Office Action, p. 4. However, the Applicant is unable to find any disclosure within the Nemoto reference to support the allegation that Nemoto discloses the aforementioned features at Figs. 1-9.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Nemoto neither discloses nor suggests at least the feature of prohibiting the active anti-vibration supporting device from operating

when an abnormality is detected in an operational state of the engine, as recited in claim 1.

For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record. As claim 1 is allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 2-10, which depend from allowable claim 1, are similarly allowable over the cited art of record.

The Applicant also submits that claim 11 is allowable over the cited art of record at least because the cited art of record does not disclose or suggest at least the feature of prohibiting cylinder suspension of the engine when an abnormality in an operational state of the active anti-vibration supporting device is detected, as recited in claim 11.

For at least this reason, the Applicant submits that claim 11 is allowable over the cited art of record. As claim 11 is allowable, the Applicant submits that claims 12-20, which depend from allowable claim 11, are similarly allowable over the cited art of record.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-20 patentability distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and an issuance of a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged

to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket no. 107348-00393.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox, PLLC



Michele L. Connell
Registration No. 52,763

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-3695
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6104

CMM/MLC